DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 348 924 HE 025 761

AUTHOR MacDougall, Mary Ann; And Others
TITLE Cultural Anxiety of Chinese and U.S. Students.
SPONS AGENCY Pacific Cultural Foundation, Taipei (Taiwan).
PUB DATE Apr 92
NOTE 27p.; Paper presented at the Annual Convention of the American Educational Research Association (San Francisco, CA, April 20-25, 1992).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Anxiety; Chinese; College Students; Comparative Analysis; Construct Validity; Content Validity; *Cross Cultural Studies; Cultural Context; Cultural Influences; Evaluation Methods; Foreign Nationals; *Foreign Students; Higher Education; Questionnaires; Research Methodology; Statistical Analysis
IDENTIFIERS *Chinese People

ABSTRACT

This paper discusses the development of a Cultural Anxiety Scale (CAS) for Chinese students studying in the United States. One hundred items were developed using the anxiety research literature, a survey of research on stress and anxiety among college students, and Chinese cross-cultural studies. Face, construct, and content validity analysis were performed. Three CAS versions in Chinese and English (Forms A and B) were administered. The first version was all English and administered to U.S. students (N=50) only; the second and third versions were tested on bilingual students (N=50). Both forms were then administered to 206 U.S. students and 221 Chinese students (in Taiwan). Data analysis (t-test) indicated significant differences between nationality on Forms A and B and no significant differences between gender. In addition, no statistically significant results were found when comparing the mean cultural anxiety of U.S. students between Forms A and B, however, statistically significant results were found in Chinese anxiety between the two forms. It was determined that because two forms were developed for the study, shades of meaning were being revealed in cultural validity. Attachments include the final versions of Forms A and B in English and Chinese translations and the item means and standard deviations. Contains 43 references. (GLR)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED348924

CULTURAL ANXIETY OF CHINESE AND U. S. STUDENTS

Presented by:

Mary Ann MacDougall
Professor, University of Virginia

Mei-Hue Wei
Associate Professor, Taichung College, Taiwan

Miriam D. Corcoran
President, Virginia Computer Institute

Presented to:

American Educational Research Association
1992 Annual Convention
San Francisco, April 20-25

HE 025 761

Supported by:

The Pacific Cultural Foundation
Taiwan, R.O.C.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Mary Ann MacDougall

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Introduction

According to Carter and Sedlacek's report (1985), it is estimated that by 1990, one million international students may be attending colleges and universities in the United States. Among foreign students, Chinese students represent the largest percentage. The needs of foreign students and obligations of institutions are ever increasing. Surveys of foreign students have shown that it is no easy task to obtain an education in the United States. Cultural, social, financial, and academic factors have been shown to influence their success in the U.S. and country of origin (Chu, 1971; Ko, 1978).

Cultural shock often experienced by foreign students may include loneliness, depression, irritability, or rigidity, none of which are conducive to academic potential or success (Reinicke, 1986). Surveys of international students show that study, writing, and library skills, as well as test taking anxiety, rank high among educational problems (Leong, 1984). Social and personal actions are constrained. Knowing appropriate behaviors, making friends, relating to students and instructors may become cultural barriers (Hartung, 1983). Financial concerns are a continuing problem for foreign students. Cultural shock often results in somatic anxiety and physical illness (Leong,1984; Ward, 1962).

The purpose of our research was to develop and assess a Cultural Anxiety Scale for Asian and American students. Perceptions of self, culture, and anxiety were essential to the conceptualization of our scale. Festinger's (1954) theory of social comparison provided the basis for relating these concepts. In the absence of objective information, students compare themselves with others in order to assess the accuracy of a belief or the mastery of a given ability. According to Festinger, this comparison process is not viewed as a mere preference; rather, it is thought to have the qualities of a social drive (Crano and Crano, 1984).

Festinger's theory describing the social comparative model has been extended by the research of Goethals & Darly, 1977; Jones & Regan, 1974; Goethals & Darly, Suls & Miller, 1977. One area in which considerable refinement to the theory has been made is concerned with the individual's choice of the "other" with whom to form a comparison (Carno and Crano, 1984). Our conceptualization of a Cultural Anxiety Scale contains anxiety items related to Self, Others (socialization) and to Environment (Academic, Living Conditions, etc.).

We have presented in Figure 1 a Table of Specifications citing major sources used to ensure an equitable and comprehensive distribution of components of anxiety across cultural characteristics and environmental experiences for U.S. and Chinese students studying in the United States.

Figure 1: Table of Specifications

Domains	References
Personal:	
worry	Bourne, 1975;
emotionality	Furnham & Trezise, 1983;
anxiety	Klineberg & Hull, 1979;
depression	Ko, 1978;
stress	Nelson, 1958;
alienation	Yen et al., 1979;
nervous	Leong, 1984
impatience	
fear	
lonely	
frustration	
sickness	
Social:	
making friends	Hurtung, 1983
communication (cross-cultural)	
sharing personal life	
cultural shock (cultural difference)	Church, 1982
social skills	
male and female relationship	
level of adjustment	Deutsch, 1970; Hull, 1978;
unfriendliness of community	Klineberg & Hull, 1979;
different life style and value system	Yao, Esther and Lee, 1983
attitude toward life	
maintenance of cultural customs	Stafford, Marion, and Salter
adjustment of social customs and norms	Church, 1982
adjusting to being away from home	Chickering, 1969;
living with peers	Walton, 1968
being autonomous	
cultural adaptation	Taft, 1977
sojourning	
settling	
subcultural mobility	
segregation	Mickle, 1984
changes in society	Hull, 1981;
social support network	Leong, 1984
participation in community activities	Surdam, Collins, 1984
religious participation and attitudes	Pruitt, 1978
social interaction	Heikinheimo & Shute, 1986
racial discrimination	
content validity	
social interaction	
Academic:	
education opportunities	
academic learning atmosphere	M. Fasheh, 1984
academic competitive	
academic system	P.S. Heikinheimo & J.C.M. academic
performance (achievement)	Shute, 1986
grading system	Hull, 1981; Mickle, 1984.
getting good grade	
getting higher degree	White, 1981
family expectations	Nice & Braun, 1977
expectation of academic performance	
academic adjustment	Leong, 1984

Figure 1: Table of Specifications (continued

Domains	References
different class styles	
language skills	Sharon, 1972
writing skills	Maxwell, 1974
the ability of presenting	MacDonald, 1981
heavy academic pressure	
speak up in class	
test-taking	
team work	Leong and Sedlacek, 1984

In summary, we developed 100 items using the anxiety research literature, survey research of stress and anxiety among college students, and Chinese cross-cultural studies. We drew extensively on studies contained in The Psychology of the Chinese People (Ed., Michael Harris Bond), especially the article, "Chinese Personality and Its Change," Kuo-shu Yang, to complement our content and construct validity.

Development, Validity, and Reliability of CAS

The construction of the Cultural Anxiety Scale (CAS) began in 1989, with a proposal submitted to the Pacific Cultural Foundation, November, 1989. Shortly thereafter, the Pacific Cultural Foundation supported the development, validation and reliability studies.

Content Validity. As a result of our extensive research, and review and analysis of extant studies, we generated 100 items to be translated into English and Chinese versions. We subjected both versions to open-ended criticism of three bilingual experts. Using their critiques, we revised, added and eliminated several

items. After our initial intensive interviews, we prepared the initial draft of the Cultural Anxiety Scale containing 100 revised items using the Table of Specifications presented in Figure 1. Results of content analysis were presented at the Eastern Educational Research Association (MacDougall & Wei, February, 1990).

Face Validity. We prepared three versions of the Cultural Anxiety Scale. The first version was all English to be administered to U.S. students. The second and third versions were tested on bilingual students. We randomly assigned 50 bilingual students to two groups. One group was administered the first half of the questions in English, and the second half in Chinese; the order was reversed for the second group. We performed t-tests to ascertain discrepant responses as they relate to order and translation, and to discard test items if the procedure yielded discrepant responses (Brislen, Lonner, and Thorndike, 1973). The results of the analyses are presented in Table 1: Bilingual Analyses of Discrepant Responses:

Table 1: Bilingual Analysis of Discrepant Responses

Variable	Number of Cases	SD	t value	Prob. of Sig.
First 50 Items				
Form 1 (Chinese)	23	10.27	.55	.59
Form 2 (English)	27	11.12		
Second 50 Items				
Form 1 (Chinese)	23	9.45	.59	.56
Form 2 (English)	26	11.97		

It can be noted from Table 1 that no statistically significant t-ratios were observed. Neither the two test versions (order of language presentation) nor the forms (Chinese vs. English translation) differed with respect to cultural anxiety. Thus, no bias relative to English and Chinese translations were observed. We compared the responses of bilingual students with U.S. students (n = 101). The statistical analysis yielded no significant results at the .05 level, showing no systematic bias between the scores of U.S. and Chinese Students.

After we had established no bias between Chinese and U.S. students, we computed reliability and validity statistics using SPSS-X. The complete set of data for our initial analyses was n = 75 for U.S. and n =75 for Chinese students. We computed Cronbach's Alpha yielding high reliability for all items (>.80), and we obtained stable structures using Factor Analyses.

Construct Validity. After the tests were graded and recorded, we validated our content analysis through Factor Analysis. After reviewing test results and observing high factor loadings, we developed Form A and Form B for our Cultural Anxiety Scale. At this juncture, we enlarged our sample to n = 206 U.S. students and n = 221 Chinese students (completed sets). We then administered Forms A and B in Fall and Spring semester, 1990-1991 at Taiwanese and U. S. universities.

The results of our administration showed stable factors for Forms A and B of the Cultural Anxiety Scale. After several statistical and content analyses, we reduced the number of items

in each form to 30. Our content and statistical analyses revealed two factors for Form A and Form B: Positive Feelings and Negative Feelings (all factor loadings were >.30 and many were >.60).

Item Reliability and Validity Statistics. After we finalized the inclusion of items in both forms, we computed Cronbach's Alpha for all items in Forms A and B. Our test results yielded 30 items on Form A and 30 items on Form B with individual Alpha's >.79 for all items (see Attachment A for copies of Final Versions: Form A and Form B, English and Chinese Translations).

Summarily, results of our t-test analyses revealed no bias in translation; factor analyses confirmed content and construct validity; and Cronbach's Alpha provided evidence of item consistency and reliability (Form A = .88, Form B = .81).

Analyses of Subpopulations

In our next phase of analyses, we investigated possible differences between gender and nationality. The results of t-test analyses indicated significant differences between nationality on Forms A and B (Table 2) and no significant differences between gender (Table 3). Because significant differences were observed between U. S. and chinese cultures, normative data, including raw scores, t scores, and percentiles, were generated from Forms A and B for Chinese and U.S. students. additionally, we computed the means and standard deviations for

all items.

Table 2: T-tests of Anxiety Scale by Nationality

Group	No. of Cases	Mean	SD	t Value	Sig.
Form A					
American	106	91.14	8.16	11.47	.00
Chinese	120	77.66	9.36		
Form B					
American	121	91.71	6.95	8.47	.00
Chinese	117	82.10	10.29		

Table 3: T-tests of Anxiety Scale by Gender

Group	No. of Cases	Mean	SD	t Value	Sig.
Form A					
Male	106	84.43	10.71	.33	.74
Female	138	83.95	11.47		
Form B					
Male	95	87.01	11.08	-.04	.97
Female	153	87.07	9.13		

A second analysis using the t statistic compared the mean cultural anxiety of U.S. students between Form A and Form B. We found no statistically significant results ($t = -.57$, $p = .571$). However, a statistical comparison of Chinese anxiety between the two forms yielded significant results ($t = -3.48$, $p = .001$). This unexpected result lead us to review and examine validity dimensions (see Attachment B for means, standard deviations for all items on Forms A and B for Chinese and U.S. students).

Results and Discussion

Statistical differences and theoretical distinctions prompted our discussion of results to begin with cultural differences using common validity parameters. The more conventional measures of validity which we considered were:

Face Validity:	statistical tests using bilingual translations and critiques offered by bilingual students;
Content Validity:	topics derived from survey research and Table of Specifications;
Construct Validity:	temperament/personality of U.S. and Asian cultures.

After we had established face, content, and construct validity, we were in a position to explain why the Chinese students regularly responded lower on Forms A and B than did U.S. students. We returned to our Table of Specifications to explain why U.S. students responded more positively than did their Chinese counterparts. The research studies focused on temperament; i.e., the Chinese culture in general responds in a more conservative manner.

A second question arose from the fact that the mean responses of U.S. students did not differ between Forms A and B, but that a significant mean difference was observed between Forms A and B for the Chinese group of students (scoring higher on Form B). For this reason, we proposed a fourth validity proposition - to explain why U.S. students were equivalent on Forms A and B, and the Chinese students were not:

Cultural Validity:	tenor, the course of thought that is related to something written or spoken, revealing **shades of meaning** having a particular direction for a culture.

We examined the means and standard deviations for all items on Forms A and B, U.S. and Chinese responses. In only one instance on Form A did the Chinese students respond more positively than U.S. students. In contrast, on Form B, Chinese students responded more positively six times. Constructs such as, "worry," "shaky," "self restrained," were used on Form B, while "patience" was included in the only item in Form A in which Chinese students responded higher. We were careful to check the content of all items on both forms; however, we inadvertently omitted emotional terms, such as **worry**, from Form A, and included them in Form B - and in these instances, Chinese students responded more positively than U.S. students.

Had we not developed two forms, we would be unaware of shades of meaning revealed in cultural validity. For this reason, in addition to the usual validity procedures, we recommend the development of at least two forms of an affective test. In cases in which one culture does not differ on the two forms and the other culture responds differently, one could test the presence and absence of "emotionally" laden (or other terms) in contrast to the parallel forms of a test and the cultural origin. This suggested procedure might be considered somewhat analogous to Solomon's four group design in which pre-test sensitivity was observed across treatment groups. In our case, cultural sensitivity is the issue, identified through interaction analysis.

In conclusion, all colleges and universities present a new culture for U.S. and international students. The cultural

Anxiety Scale (CAS) represents the first instrument which is developed from cross-cultural studies normed on Chinese college students studying in Taiwan. We included U.S. students to ensure a reality base as Chinese students acquire cultural learning as they study in the United States. It is our intention that CAS will provide insights into the cultural anxiety of Chinese and U.S. students, provide a methodological basis for research, and ultimately, a more enjoyable and productive college experience.

References

Ariete S., & Bemprad, J. (1980). Severe and mild depression. London: Tavistock.

Beck, A. T. (1967). Depression: Clinical experimental and theoretical aspects. New York: Harper and Row.

Beck, A. T. (1983). Cognitive theory of depression: New perspectives. In P. J. Cayton, & J. E. Barett (Eds.), Treatment of depression: Old controversies and new approaches. New York: Raven Press.

Berry, J. W. (1976). Human ecology and cognitive styles: Students in cultural and psychological adaptation. New York: Sage/Halsted.

Bond, Michael Harris. (Ed). (1986). The psychology of the Chinese people. New York: Oxford University Press.

Bourne, P. G. (1975). The Chinese student: Acculturation and mental illness. Psychiatry, 38, 269-277.

Carter, R. T., & Sedlacek, W. E. (1985). Needs and characteristics of undergraduate international students (Research Report #1, p 86). College Park: Maryland University.

Chickering, A. W. (1969). Education and identity. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Church, A. T. (1982). Sojourner adjustment. Psychological Bulletin, 91, 540-572.

Chu, H. M. et al., (1971). A study of Chinese students adjustment in the USA. Acta Psychological Taiwaneseca, March, #13.

Deutsch, J. M. (1970). International education and exchange: A sociological analysis. Cleveland: Case Western Reserve University Press.

Furnham, A., & Trezise, L. (1983). The mental health of foreign students. Social Science and Medicine, 17, 365-370.

Goodwin, C. D., & Nacht, M. (1983). Absence of decision. New York: Institute of International Education.

Hartung, E. A. (1983). Cultural Adjustments and difficulties of Japanese adolescents sojourning in the USA. Occasional Papers in Intercultural Learning, No. 5. New York: International/Intercultural Programs, Inc.

Harvey, O. J., Hunt, D. E., & Schroder, H. M. (1961). Conceptual systems and personality organization. New York: John Wiley and Sons.

Hull, W. F. (1978). A modified culture contact hypothesis and the adaptation of foreign students in cross-cultural settings. In S. C. Dunnett (Ed.), Factors affecting the adaptation of foreign students in cross-cultural settings.

Jenkins, H. M. et al., (1983). Educating students from other nations: American colleges and universities. International Educational Exchange. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc.

Klineberg, O., & Hull, W. F. (1979). At a foreign university: An international study of adaptation and coping. New York: Praeger.

Ko, Y. H. (1978). The mental health of the overseas Chinese students in the new environment. Acta Psychologica Taiwanica, 20, 1-7.

Kroeber, T. C. (1963). The coping functions of ego mechanisms. In R. W. White (Ed.), The study of lives: Essays in honor of Henry A. Murray. New York: Atherton.

Leong, F. T. L. (1984). Counseling center research report No. 6-82. College Park: University of Maryland.

MacDonald, A. F. (1981). Integrating skills through formal debate in the upper level ESL classroom. Exercise Exchange, 25, 21-26.

MacDougall, M. A., & Brown, R. (1984). The temporal order of depression and anxiety. In R. Schwarzer (Ed.), The self in anxiety stress and depression, advances in psychology.

MacDougall, M. A., & Wei, M. (1990, February). Test anxiety of Chinese and U. S. graduate students. Paper presented at the Eastern Educational Research Association, Clearwater, FL.

Maxwell, M> J. (1974). Foreign students and American academic ritual. Journal of Reading, 17, 301-305.

McCluskey, W. H. (1969). Are we doing our best? Improving College and University Teaching, 17, 260-261.

Mickle, K. (1984). The cross-cultural adaptation of Hong Kong students at two Ontario universities. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Ontario Institute for Studies in Education.

Miller, C. E. (1960). Intestinal parasitism in foreign students: A preliminary report. Journal of the American College Health Association, 8, 366-374.

Nelson, R. L. (1958). The psychiatric needs of foreign students. IIE Bulletin, 33(9), 13-17.

Pruitt, F. J. (1978). The adaptation of foreign students on American campuses. Journal of the NAWDAC, 41, 144-146.

Reinicke, M. J. (1986). Cultural adjustment of international students in the U.S.: A revaluation using reformulated learned helplessness. Doctor of Psychology Research Paper. CA: Biola University.

Schwarzer, R. (1986). Self related cognition in anxiety and maturation. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaun Associates, Publishers.

Sharan, A. T. (1972). English proficiency, verbal aptitude, and foreign student success in American graduate schools. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 32, 425-431.

Speilberger, C. D. et al., (1976). The state-trait anxiety inventory (test manual). Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologist Press.

SPSS, Inc. (1986). (2nd ed.). Chicago, IL.

Surdam, J., & Collins, J. (1984). Adaption of international students: A cause for concern. Journal of College Students Personnel, 25, 241-245.

Taft, R. (1977). Coping with unfamiliar cultures. In N. Warren (Ed.), Studies in cross-cultural psychology. London: Academic Press.

Titchener, J. L., & Rossa, W. D. (1974). Acute or chronic stress as determinants of behavior, character, and neurosis. In S. Ariti (Ed.), American Handbook of Psychiatry, Vol. 3. NY: Basic Books.

Walton, B. J. (1968). Foreign student exchange in perspective: What the research tells us. International Educational and Cultural Exchange, 3, 1-14.

Ward, L. K. (1962). Some observations of the underlying dynamics of conflict in foreign students. Journal of the American College Health Association, 10, 430-440.

White, S., & White, T. G. (1981). Acculturation of foreign graduate students in relation to their English language proficiency. In S. C. Dunnett (Ed.), Factors affecting the adaptation of foreign students in cross-cultural settings (Special Studies Series No. 134). Buffalo: State University of New York at Buffalo, Council on International Studies.

Yang, Kuo-Shu. (1986). Chinese personality and its change. The Psychology of the Chinese People. NY: Oxford University Press.

Yeh, E. K., et al. (1979). Psychiatric implications of cross-cultural education. Chinese students in the U.S.A. Acta Psychologica Taiwanica, 21, 1-26.

ATTACHMENT A

Final Versions: Form A and Form B

English and Chinese Translations

SELF-EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE (FORM A)

DIRECTIONS

A number of statements which people have used to describe themselves are given below. Please read each statement and then check the box to the right of the statement to indicate how you **generally** *feel. For example "I feel disappointed", if you never feel disappointed, please check the box under 1, if you always feel disappointed, please check the box under 4.*

	1. Never or Almost Never	2. Sometimes	3 Often	4. Always or Almost Always
1. Life is tough	( )	( )	( )	( )
2. I see hope in the future	( )	( )	( )	( )
3. I am satisfied with my academic performance	( )	( )	( )	( )
4. I feel lonely	( )	( )	( )	( )
5. I think being patient is rewarding	( )	( )	( )	( )
6. I accomplish what I plan	( )	( )	( )	( )
7. I feel relaxed	( )	( )	( )	( )
8. I enjoy participating in discussions in my classes	( )	( )	( )	( )
9. I feel comfortable with authority figures	( )	( )	( )	( )
10. I need some changes in my life	( )	( )	( )	( )
11. I have friends to talk to when something bothers me	( )	( )	( )	( )
12. I enjoy life	( )	( )	( )	( )
13. I feel frustrated	( )	( )	( )	( )
14. I am involved in school activities	( )	( )	( )	( )
15. I believe I will be a successful person	( )	( )	( )	( )
16. I feel uneasy when I meet others	( )	( )	( )	( )
17. I am sure I will get my degree	( )	( )	( )	( )
18. I have trouble concentrating on learning	( )	( )	( )	( )
19. I think getting a good education is extremely important	( )	( )	( )	( )
20. I use discipline in my studies	( )	( )	( )	( )
21. I blame myself when things go wrong	( )	( )	( )	( )
22. My heart pounds in social settings	( )	( )	( )	( )
23. I feel fate is on my side	( )	( )	( )	( )
24. My life is stable	( )	( )	( )	( )

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

	1. Never or Almost Never	2. Sometimes	3. Often	4 Always or Almost Always
25. I feel that people stare at me	( )	( )	( )	( )
26. I present my ideas clearly	( )	( )	( )	( )
27. I get nervous when I am called on in class	( )	( )	( )	( )
28. I feel I need to work harder when I hear somebody else is doing better than me	( )	( )	( )	( )
29. I meet my own expectations	( )	( )	( )	( )
30. It is difficult for me to adjust to society's expectations	( )	( )	( )	( )

DEMOGRAPHIC:

Please provide the following information about yourself by marking "x" or filling in the blank on the appropriate line.

1. Sex: ____M ____F

2. Nationality: _____(please specify)

3. Level of Education: ____Graduate ____Undergraduate

4. Age: ____Under 20
   ____21-30
   ____31-50
   ____Above 50

5. Major of study: _____(please specify)

6. The highest level of education attained by your parents is:

Father	Mother		Father	Mother	
___	___	No Education	___	___	Bachelor
___	___	Elementary	___	___	Master
___	___	Middle School	___	___	Doctor
___	___	High School	___	___	Other

SELF-EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE(FORM B)

DIRECTIONS

A number of statements which people have used to describe themselves are given below. Please read each statement and then check the box to the right of the statement to indicate how you **generally** *feel. For example "I feel disappointed", if you never feel disappointed, please check the box under 1, if you always feel disappointed, please check the box under 4.*

	1. Never or Almost Never	2. Sometimes	3. Often	4. Always or Almost Always
1. My social life is enjoyable	( )	( )	( )	( )
2. I get along with my professors	( )	( )	( )	( )
3. I worry about my financial situation	( )	( )	( )	( )
4. I think being independent is important	( )	( )	( )	( )
5. I feel upset if my academic achievement does not meet my expectations	( )	( )	( )	( )
6. I feel comfortable making a presentation in front of the class	( )	( )	( )	( )
7. I have confidence my social skills	( )	( )	( )	( )
8. I am an island unto myself	( )	( )	( )	( )
9. Professors are fair in their evaluations	( )	( )	( )	( )
10. I am in control of my life	( )	( )	( )	( )
11. I worry about finding a job after graduation	( )	( )	( )	( )
12. My grades are very important to me	( )	( )	( )	( )
13. I get along with the people around me	( )	( )	( )	( )
14. I am satisfied with my housing	( )	( )	( )	( )
15. I find myself keyed up	( )	( )	( )	( )
16. To be successful, my efforts are more important than luck	( )	( )	( )	( )
17. I feel shaky during tests	( )	( )	( )	( )
18. I wish I could be more assertive	( )	( )	( )	( )
19. My nerves gets tight when I prepare assignments	( )	( )	( )	( )
20. I have confidence in my writing skills	( )	( )	( )	( )
21. I feel a great deal of academic pressure	( )	( )	( )	( )
22. I feel calm	( )	( )	( )	( )
23. I am a self-restrained person	( )	( )	( )	( )

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

	1. Never or Almost Never	2. Sometimes	3. Often	4. Always or Almost Always
24. I feel tense meeting new people	( )	( )	( )	( )
25. I feel left out	( )	( )	( )	( )
26. I think my community is friendly	( )	( )	( )	( )
27. I feel tense during class	( )	( )	( )	( )
28. I have confidence of my academic performance	( )	( )	( )	( )
29. I feel I have been looked down upon	( )	( )	( )	( )
30. My academic achievement is very important to my family	( )	( )	( )	( )

DEMOGRAPHIC:

Please provide the following information about yourself by marking "x" or filling in the blank on the appropriate line.

1. Sex: ____M ____F

2. Nationality: _____(please specify)

3. Level of Education: ____Graduate ____Undergraduate

4. Age: ____Under 20
   ____21-30
   ____31-50
   ____Above 50

5. Major of study: _____(please specify)

6. The highest level of education attained by your parents is:

Father	Mother		Father	Mother	
___	___	No Education	___	___	Bachelor
___	___	Elementary	___	___	Master
___	___	Middle School	___	___	Doctor
___	___	High School	___	___	Other

(A) 自 我 評 估 問 卷 調 查

說明：下列陳述是有關於個人生活上的態度，請依照您的想法在每項敘述上選出最適合您個人狀況的陳述。例如：［我感到失望］如果您不曾有這種感覺，請在 1.號□內打「✓」，如果您一向都有這種感覺則請您於 4.號□內打「✓」依次類推。

	1.（幾乎）不曾	2. 有時候	3. 常常	4. 一向如此（幾乎）
1.我認為生命歷程是艱辛的	□	□	□	□
2.我對未來充滿希望	□	□	□	□
3.我對自己的學業表現感到滿意	□	□	□	□
4.我感到寂寞	□	□	□	□
5.我認為耐心會有好結果	□	□	□	□
6.我的計劃能實現	□	□	□	□
7.我感到輕鬆	□	□	□	□
8.我喜歡參加課堂上的討論	□	□	□	□
9.跟權威人物在一起時，我感覺得自在	□	□	□	□
10.我的生活需要有一些變化	□	□	□	□
11.當我遇到困難時，我有朋友可以傾訴	□	□	□	□
12.我享受生活的樂趣	□	□	□	□
13.我有挫折感	□	□	□	□
14.我參加學校的活動	□	□	□	□
15.我相信自己會是個成功的人	□	□	□	□
16.當我遇到陌生人時，我覺得不自在	□	□	□	□
17.我有把握能拿到學位	□	□	□	□
18.我不能專心學習	□	□	□	□
19.我認為接受好的教育非常重要	□	□	□	□
20.我對課業上的學習有規律	□	□	□	□
21.當事情不對時我會責怪自己	□	□	□	□
22.在公開的社交場合，我會緊張的心跳砰砰跳	□	□	□	□
23.我覺得幸運之神與我同在	□	□	□	□
24.我的生活安定	□	□	□	□
25.我感覺別人在注視我	□	□	□	□
26.我能在言語上清楚的表達自己	□	□	□	□
27.當在課堂上被問到問題時，我會緊張	□	□	□	□
28.當我知道別人表現得比我好時，我覺得自己需要加倍努力	□	□	□	□
29.我的生活達到自己的要求	□	□	□	□
30.對我而言，適應社會的要求是有困難的	□	□	□	□

個人及家庭資料：請您提供以下有關您本身及您父母的資料，除了一些問題必須加以填寫外，其餘只需在線上拘出 ✓ 適當的描述。

1.您的性別：_____男 _____女

2.您的國籍是：_____（請加以填寫）

3.您是：____大學一年級 ____大學二年級 ____大學三年級 ____大學四年級 ____研究生

4.您的年齡：____17 歲以下 ____18～25 歲 ____26～31 歲 ____32～40 歲 ____41～50 歲 ____51～60 歲 ____60 歲以上

5.您就讀那一系：_____（請加以填寫）您就讀的學校：_____（請加以填寫）

6.您父親的教育程度：_____（請加以填寫）您母親的教育程度：_____（請加以填寫）

(B) 自 我 評 估 問 卷 調 查

說明：下列的陳述是有關於個人生活上的態度，請依照您的想法在每項敘述上選出最適合您個人狀況的陳述。例如：［我感到失望］如果您不曾有這種感覺請在1.號□內打「｜」，如果您一向都有這種感覺則請您於4.號□內打「✓」依次類推。

	1.（幾乎）不曾	2. 有時候	3. 常常	4. 一向如此（幾乎）
1.我有愉快的社交生活	□	□	□	□
2.我和老師之間的關係融洽	□	□	□	□
3.我擔心自己的經濟狀況	□	□	□	□
4.我認為獨立自主是重要的	□	□	□	□
5.當我的學業表現沒有達到自己期望，我覺得煩惱	□	□	□	□
6.在課堂上做演講（報告）我覺得自在	□	□	□	□
7.我對自己的社交能力有信心	□	□	□	□
8.我覺得孤助無援	□	□	□	□
9.老師給我的成績是公平的	□	□	□	□
10.我能夠掌握自己的命運	□	□	□	□
11.我擔心畢業以後找工作的問題	□	□	□	□
12.我的成績對我很重要	□	□	□	□
13.我和周圍的人相處得好	□	□	□	□
14.我滿意自己的居住環境	□	□	□	□
15.我發現自己情緒緊張	□	□	□	□
16.我認為要想成功，個人的努力比運氣更重要	□	□	□	□
17.在考試時，我覺得自己在顫抖	□	□	□	□
18.我希望自己能較有主見一點	□	□	□	□
19.在準備課業時，我發現自己神經緊張	□	□	□	□
20.我對自己的書寫能力有信心	□	□	□	□
21.我覺得課業壓力很重	□	□	□	□
22.我覺得心情平靜	□	□	□	□
23.我是個自我約束的人	□	□	□	□
24.我和陌生人見面，我會覺得緊張	□	□	□	□
25.我有被冷落的感覺	□	□	□	□
26.我認為我住的社區很和睦	□	□	□	□
27.在上課時我會覺得緊張	□	□	□	□
28.我對自己的學業表現有信心	□	□	□	□
29.我有被看不起的感覺	□	□	□	□
30.我的家人很在意我的學業成就（表現）	□	□	□	□

個人及家庭資料：請您提供以下有關您本身及您父母的資料，除了一些問題必須加以填寫外，其餘只需在線上打出✓適當的描述。

1.您的性別：_____男 _____女

2.您的國籍是：_____（請加以填寫）

3.您是：____大學一年級 ____大學二年級 ____大學三年級 ____大學四年級 ____研究生

4.您的年齡：____17歲以下 ____18～25歲 ____26～31歲 ____32～40歲 ____41～50歲 ____51～60歲 ____60歲以上

5.您就讀那一系：_____（請加以填寫）您就讀的學校：_____（請加以填寫）

6.您父親的教育程度：_____（請加以填寫）您母親的教育程度：_____（請加以填寫）

ATTACHMENT B

Item Means and Standard Deviations

Form A and Form B

THE MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS FOR U.S. AND CHINESE STUDENTS

	FORM A/U.S.		FORM A/CHINESE			
ITEM NO.	MEAN	SD	MEAN	SD	MEAN DIF	SD DIF
1	3.06	0.43	2.90	0.78	0.16	-0.35
2	3.46	0.65	2.73	0.81	0.73	-0.16
3	2.61	0.76	1.94	0.58	0.67	0.18
4	3.33	0.47	3.09	0.81	0.24	-0.34
5	2.78	0.77	2.90	0.63	-0.12	0.14
6	2.81	0.60	2.25	0.66	0.56	-0.06
7	2.58	0.66	2.35	0.87	0.23	-0.21
8	2.44	0.79	2.22	0.84	0.22	-0.05
9	2.91	0.71	1.71	0.82	1.20	-0.11
10	2.96	0.52	2.68	0.89	0.28	-0.37
11	3.38	0.83	2.70	0.80	0.68	0.03
12	3.30	0.62	2.66	0.51	0.64	0.11
13	3.10	0.31	2.98	0.70	0.12	-0.39
14	2.69	0.87	2.46	0.88	0.23	-0.01
15	3.26	0.70	2.41	0.82	0.85	-0.12
16	3.36	0.60	2.95	0.82	0.41	-0.22
17	3.77	0.55	2.25	0.98	1.52	-0.43
18	3.18	0.52	2.89	0.70	0.29	-0.18
19	3.70	0.66	3.41	0.77	0.29	-0.11
20	2.37	0.79	2.02	0.64	0.35	0.15
21	2.90	0.62	2.79	0.68	0.11	-0.06
22	3.41	0.49	2.94	0.77	0.47	-0.28
23	2.54	0.83	2.22	0.83	0.32	0.00
24	3.04	0.78	2.96	0.86	0.08	-0.08
25	3.73	0.45	3.15	0.55	0.58	-0.10
26	2.72	0.62	2.45	0.76	0.27	-0.14
27	2.96	0.80	2.47	0.95	0.49	-0.15
28	2.90	0.67	2.28	1.03	0.62	-0.36
29	2.75	0.69	2.05	0.76	0.70	-0.07
30	3.43	0.56	3.28	0.61	0.15	-0.05
AVG	3.05	0.64	2.60	0.77	0.44	-0.13

THE MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS FOR U.S. AND CHINESE STUDENTS

	FORM B/U.S.		FORM B/CHINESE			
ITEM NO.	MEAN	SD	MEAN	SD	MEAN DIF	SD DIF
1	3.30	0.69	2.53	0.75	0.77	-0.06
2	3.17	0.63	2.59	0.74	0.58	-0.11
3	2.99	0.66	3.19	0.84	-0.20	-0.18
4	3.46	0.63	3.41	0.74	0.05	-0.11
5	3.22	0.80	2.84	0.80	0.38	0.00
6	2.32	0.98	1.68	0.74	0.64	0.24
7	3.11	0.72	2.29	0.79	0.82	-0.07
8	3.24	0.49	3.39	0.59	-0.15	-0.10
9	2.73	0.63	2.75	0.74	-0.02	-0.11
10	3.16	0.70	2.50	0.86	0.66	-0.16
11	2.87	0.83	2.96	0.85	-0.09	-0.02
12	3.36	0.66	2.57	0.95	0.79	-0.29
13	3.49	0.62	2.90	0.73	0.59	-0.11
14	3.26	0.82	2.59	0.87	0.67	-0.05
15	3.09	0.44	2.78	0.81	0.31	-0.37
16	3.21	0.72	3.13	0.85	0.08	-0.13
17	3.05	0.66	3.24	0.75	-0.19	-0.09
18	2.96	0.72	2.65	0.85	0.31	-0.13
19	3.27	0.50	3.23	0.67	0.04	-0.17
20	2.67	0.84	2.27	0.94	0.40	-0.10
21	2.62	0.72	2.32	0.81	0.30	-0.09
22	2.83	0.65	2.39	0.76	0.44	-0.11
23	2.57	0.85	2.59	0.79	-0.02	0.06
24	3.18	0.70	2.89	0.87	0.29	-0.17
25	3.38	0.54	3.18	0.61	0.20	-0.07
26	2.99	0.65	2.54	0.92	0.45	-0.27
27	3.53	0.55	3.26	0.60	0.27	-0.05
28	2.87	0.77	2.17	0.76	0.70	0.01
29	3.49	0.50	3.45	0.60	0.04	-0.10
30	3.16	0.88	2.74	0.97	0.42	-0.09
AVG	3.09	0.69	2.77	0.79	0.32	-0.10